

Exhibit F



Degradation of polypropylene in vivo: a microscopic analysis of meshes explanted from patients

Journal:	<i>Journal of Biomedical Materials Research: Part B - Applied Biomaterials</i>
Manuscript ID:	JBMR-B-15-0208.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Research Report
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Iakovlev, Vladimir; St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology; Vladimir Iakovlev, Guelcher, Scott; Vanderbilt University, Department of Chemical Engineering Bendavid, Robert; Shouldice Hospital, Surgery
Keywords:	Mesh, Polypropylene, degradation, microscopy, pathology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Degradation of polypropylene *in vivo*: a microscopic analysis of**
4
5 **meshes explanted from patients**

6
7 **Vladimir V. Iakovlev¹, Scott A. Guelcher², Robert Bendavid³**

8
9
10
11 1. Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto; Division of
12 Pathology and Keenan Research Centre of the Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute,
13 St. Michael's Hospital; Toronto, Canada
14
15 2. Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, School of Engineering, Vanderbilt
16 University, Nashville, USA
17
18 3. Surgery, Shouldice Hospital, Thornhill, Canada

19
20 Correspondence to:
21
22 Dr. Vladimir Iakovlev, Pathology, St. Michael's Hospital, 30 Bond Street, CC2-093,
23 Toronto, ON M5B1W8, Canada.
24 iakovlev.v@gmail.com

25
26 Dr. Robert Bendavid, Shouldice Hospital, 7750 Bayview Avenue, Thornhill, ON L3T
27 4A3, Canada. rbendavid@sympatico.ca

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Keywords: Polypropylene; Mesh; Degradation; Pathology; Microscopy; Hernia; Vaginal

Running head: Degradation of polypropylene *in vivo*

1
2
3 ABSTRACT
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Polypropylene meshes, originally introduced for hernia repair, are presently utilized in several anatomical sites. Several million are implanted annually worldwide. Depending on the device, up to 10% will be excised to treat complications. The excised meshes can provide material to study the complications, however, they have remained underutilized over the last decades and the mechanisms of complications continue to be incompletely understood. The fundamental question as to whether polypropylene degrades *in vivo* is still debated. We have examined 164 excised meshes using conventional microscopy to search for features of polypropylene degradation. 4 specimens were also examined by transmission electron microscopy. The degraded material, detected by its ability to absorb dyes in the degradation nanopores, formed a continuous layer at the surface of the mesh fibers. It retained birefringence, inclusions of non-degraded polypropylene, and showed ability to meld with the non-degraded fiber core when heated by the surgical cautery. Several features indicated that the degradation layer formed *in vivo*: inflammatory cells trapped within fissures, melting caused by cautery of excision surgery, and gradual but progressive growth of the degradation layer while in the body. Cracking of the degraded material indicated a contribution to clinically important mesh stiffening and deformation. Chemical products of degradation need to be analyzed and studied for their role in the mesh-body interactions. The described methods can also be used to study degradation of other materials.

INTRODUCTION

Polypropylene meshes were introduced in the late 50's for hernia repair.¹ Over the next decades, their use spread to other anatomical sites. Presently, they are employed in millions of surgeries worldwide and this expansive use has been catalyzed by the rapid proliferation of new and minimally invasive surgical techniques.^{2,3} Depending on the anatomical site, in published reports to date, 2-10% of implanted meshes are explanted or partially excised for complications such as pain, infection, erosion through the vaginal mucosa and other adjacent structures, urinary symptoms or recurrence of a herniation.⁴

⁹ These excision specimens generate a large, but underutilized body of study material. Surprisingly, there are very few studies reporting findings of polypropylene explants from patients. A small number of animal studies, which are more expensive to conduct, have been published, however these had the obvious limitations associated with animal experiments. This has created a paradoxical situation in which despite the long history of use and the large volume of explanted polypropylene devices, the causes and mechanisms of complications associated with the mesh remain incompletely understood. For example, the fundamental question as to whether polypropylene degrades *in vivo* is still unresolved 50 years after its introduction as an implantable material.^{10,11}

Degradation of polymers, and polypropylene more specifically has been studied outside the medical field. The typical features of changing appearance of degrading polymers are cracks and irregularity of the surface.¹²⁻¹⁴ Polymer breakdown can be caused by physical factors, such as high temperature and ultraviolet light, as well as chemical factors, such as oxidation. Biodegradation, a form of chemical degradation,

1
2
3 has been studied outside of medical settings as bacterial degradation of polypropylene
4 discarded in the environment. The study revealed polypropylene surface changes
5 similar to those induced by the physical factors.¹⁵ In animals, the initial experiments
6 which used mechanical and spectral methods of testing, showed that polypropylene
7 fibers underwent oxidative degradation when implanted in mammals. The detected
8 changes were similar to autoxidation of the polymer at elevated temperatures.¹⁶ In that
9 study chemical induction of the surface was observed at 108 days for unstabilized
10 polypropylene, while induction was delayed by the addition of antioxidants during the
11 manufacturing process. In the body, oxidative degradation facilitated by macrophages
12 surrounding the mesh fibers was thought to be the major contributor.¹⁷⁻²⁰ When
13 scanning electron microscopy was introduced into the field, the studies focused on
14 surface changes of explanted polypropylene.²¹⁻²⁹ These reports showed cracking and
15 scaling of the surface, both of which became the subject of interpretation and
16 speculation. Alternative explanations were either cracking of a biological material
17 formed by deposited proteins, or polypropylene degradation induced by chemical and
18 physical factors of specimen handling after excision. The explanted material from
19 humans is usually fixed in formalin. Additionally, to expose the surface, the mesh
20 needed to be cleaned to remove ingrown tissue, which was done using chemical
21 methods. These aspects have been points of criticism and it has been questioned
22 whether the methodology could fully exclude artefacts of exposure to chemicals,
23 intra/postoperative handling and residual tissue or biological films. We employed a
24 different methodology by studying cross sections of explanted mesh, without its
25 separation from tissues. This approach allowed us to avoid possible artefacts
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 associated with tissue removal and enabled side-by-side comparison of degraded and
4
5 non-degraded polypropylene as well as the surrounding tissue components.
6
7
8
9

10 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**
11

12 **Specimens**
13

14 After approval of the St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board, 164 consecutive
15 explanted knitted polypropylene mesh specimens received at the pathology department
16 were reviewed. The specimens were from St. Michael's and Shouldice hospital
17 inpatients and outside referrals. Approximately 70% of specimens were potential or
18 active medico-legal cases. More details are provided in Table 1.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Specimen processing**
30

31 The specimens were received as tissue in formalin in 128 cases and paraffin embedded
32 tissue in 36 cases. Tissue received in formalin was processed using Leica TP1020
33 tissue processor. For all specimens, either received in formalin or paraffin, exposure to
34 formalin was assessed as <72hrs in 18 cases, between 72hrs and 1month for 16
35 specimens, and > 1 month for the remaining specimens.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45 **Staining**
46

47 Tissue was sectioned at 4 μ m and all sections were initially stained by haematoxylin and
48 eosin (H&E, Harris haematoxylin). Additionally, 3 random hernia and 7 transvaginal
49 specimens were stained by Masson trichrome and Von Kossa calcium (counterstain
50 neutral red), 10 other random cases stained in combination by Gomori trichrome,
51
52
53
54
55
56

1
2
3 Movat, Van Gieson elastin, Ziehl–Neelsen and Grocott's methenamine silver stains.^{30,31}
4
5
6 Sections of another 5 random explants were stained by immunoperoxidase technique
7
8 for IgG (DAKO, 1:50 enzyme digestion for 4 minutes) and 10 explants for
9
10 myeloperoxidase (DAKO, 1:200 without retrieval) using Ventana Benchmark XT, Gill's
11
12 haematoxylin.
13
14
15
16

17 **New mesh control**

18
19

20 Portions of pristine transvaginal sling devices of three different manufacturers were
21 placed in 10% buffered formalin. The mesh was then sampled for light microscopy at 2
22 weeks and 1, 2 and 4 months in two separate experiments. Tissue processing,
23 embedding, sectioning (charged coated slides) and staining (manual on horizontal tray)
24 were carried out according to the same protocols as for the mesh samples explanted
25 from the patients.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Measurement of degradation layer thickness**

37

38 Clinical information was reviewed to identify groups of samples from the same
39 manufacturer, the same mesh design, and verified implantation and excision dates. A
40 set of 23 midurethral slings was the largest uniform group that fulfilled these criteria.
41
42 The sections were examined to find mesh fibers sectioned perpendicularly to their long
43 axis with a cross section close to a near perfect circle to reduce the measurement error
44 of angular orientation. Staining and refractile properties were used to define the edges
45 of degraded material. The thickness of the stained layer was measured with an
46 eyepiece micrometer in at least two fibers with two measurement sites per fiber. The
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 micrometer scale was 1.0 μm at 100x objective with oil immersion and the
4
5 measurements were rounded to the closest whole number. A median value per
6
7 specimen was recorded.
8
9

10
11
12 **Transmission electron microscopy**
13

14
15 Subsamples of 1 fresh transvaginal, 6 formalin fixed transvaginal and 1 formalin fixed
16
17 hernia explant tissue were transferred into glutaraldehyde, then postfixed in osmium
18
19 tetroxide, dehydrated through a graded series of ethanol, and embedded in a mixture
20
21 of Epon 812 and Araldite 502. Blue sections were cut and assessed for the presence of
22
23 mesh fibers in the microblocks. The following 4 samples contained the fibers and were
24
25 examined using transmission electron microscopy: 1 sample of transvaginal explant
26
27 fixed fresh in glutaraldehyde, 2 samples of transvaginal explants of another
28
29 manufacturer transferred from formalin, and 1 sample of hernia explant transferred from
30
31 formalin. Thin sections were stained with uranyl acetate and lead citrate and examined
32
33 with a Hitachi 7650 electron microscope.
34
35
36
37

38
39
40 **RESULTS**
41

42
43 **Light microscopy**
44

45
46 In one case the mesh fibers could be assessed immediately after explantation, before
47
48 tissue drying or fixation in formalin. The transvaginal sling was excised because of
49
50 chronic pain 9 years after implantation. Mesh fibers at the specimen edges were free of
51
52 tissue and could be examined in a conventional microscope after a rinse in saline and
53
54 without additional preparation [Figure 1]. There were transverse cracks at the bending
55
56

1
2
3 points [Figure 1(a)] and patches of haphazard cracks on straighter portions of the fibers
4
5 [Figure 1(b)].
6
7

8 Microscopic examination of mesh fibers cross-sectioned in the histological slides
9 showed a circumferential outer layer of degraded polypropylene in 162 of 164 examined
10 explants [Figure 2(a)]. Polypropylene degradation was observed across a large range of
11 devices, produced by different manufacturers, explanted from different anatomical
12 locations and due to different clinical complications [Table 1]. The only two specimens
13 where the degradation layer was not visible were a hernia mesh and a transvaginal
14 sling removed 3 and 10 months respectively after implantation. As shown further the
15 degradation layer is difficult to detect by light microscopy within the first year after
16 implantation.
17
18

19 The degradation layer was detectable as a rim of purple material in the H&E
20 stained sections while the central core of the fibers remained clear and colorless. The
21 layer also showed variable staining by other histological stains indicating non-specific
22 trapping of the dyes by van der Waals forces and/or ionic binding. The latter appeared
23 to need a mordant where the alum, but not the iron mordant retained haematoxylin in
24 the layer of degraded polypropylene.
25
26

27 At optical resolution of light microscopy the stainable outer (degradation) layer
28 was homogeneous, without detectable fibrillation. It was of a relatively uniform thickness
29 within individual fibers and of approximately the same thickness between the fibers in
30 the same sample. The layer showed cracks and ability to detach from the non-staining
31 fiber core. It also showed adherence to the tissues. Where the core detached from the
32 glass slide, the outer layer either remained on the fiber or detached from it and stayed
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 adherent to the tissue [Figure 2(c)]. For descriptive purpose, the uniform circumferential
4 nature, fissuring and partial peeling of the layer resembled a tree bark.
5
6

7 We used polarized light microscopy³² as a routine tool for all 164 specimens to
8 confirm that the stained material was polypropylene. In polarized light, both the central
9 core of the fibers and the outer layer showed similar refractile properties [Figure 2(b)].
10
11 The light intensity was uniform within the core while the outer layer had gradual
12 reduction of the refractile ability towards the surface. Birefringence of the outer layer
13 was also observed in the segments of the “bark” separated from the core [Figure
14 2(c&d)]. At these sites, the light brightness in the “bark” layer was due to its internal
15 properties and could not be attributed to the scatter of light from the core. The adjacent
16 tissue components containing collagen also showed birefringence, however of a much
17 lower intensity. The tissue components also had a different structure and coloration.
18
19

20 Several mesh designs on the market are knitted using a combination of clear and
21 blue fibers. In our pool of specimens, at least 50 explants showed blue fibers. Blue
22 polypropylene fibers incorporated a blue dye as granules introduced into the material
23 during its manufacture [Figure 3]. The granules were seen in the non-degraded core of
24 the fibers as well as to a variable degree in the outer degradation layer. In the latter,
25 they were detected within the “bark” remaining on the core [Figure 3(a&b)] as well as in
26 the segments of the “bark” separated from the core [Figure 3(c&d)]. The granules were
27 mainly seen in the deeper layers of the “bark” and were not as frequent closer to the
28 surface, which suggests that they also undergo degradation and lose color. The finding
29 was a direct confirmation that the “bark” originated from the same material as the core
30 of the fibers.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The brittleness, staining and birefringence characteristics of the “bark” were
4
5 similar to those of calcium salts which are commonly deposited in degenerating tissues.
6
7 Von Kossa stain was used for a sample set of 10 specimens to rule out presence of
8
9 calcium salts in the outer “bark”. No calcium salts were detected in the brittle outer layer
10
11 of the 10 specimens tested [Figure 4(a)].
12
13

14
15 The Masson trichrome technique was used to analyze porosity characteristics of
16
17 the degraded layer in a representative sample of 10 specimens. The trichrome
18
19 techniques are based on competitive staining by dyes of different molecular size and
20
21 penetration ability. A dye (red for Masson) of a smaller molecular size and higher
22
23 penetration is used in combination with a dye of larger molecular size (green). The stain
24
25 showed that the deeper parts (close to the core) of the degradation layer had a finer
26
27 porosity than the more superficial parts [Figure 4(b)]. This was consistent with the
28
29 findings of transmission electron microscopy demonstrating a network of
30
31 nanocracks/nanopores expanding towards the surface.
32
33
34

35
36 To test whether the outer layer contained proteins, we used
37
38 immunohistochemical stain for the ubiquitous serum and tissue protein immunoglobulin
39
40 G (IgG). There was no detectable level of IgG in the bark layer while the
41
42 immunoglobulin was deposited at its surface [Figure 4(c)]. The finding indicated that IgG
43
44 came in contact with the fibers; however it was not a component of the “bark” layer as
45
46 would be expected in a biological film formed by serum proteins.
47
48
49

50
51 Myeloperoxidase is an oxidative enzyme expressed by the inflammatory cells
52
53 together with an array of other oxidative substances. Staining for myeloperoxidase
54
55 revealed an appearance similar to that of immunoglobulin: the enzyme was detected
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 deposited on the surface of the “bark”, but was not observed mixed within it [Figure
4
5 4(d)]. This finding further indicated incompatibility of the “bark” material with water-
6
7 soluble proteins. It also indicated an oxidative environment immediately around the
8
9 fibers.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Analysis of the effect of surgical cautery on polypropylene** 16

17 Surgical cautery instruments cause heating of the tissues to a wide range of
18 temperatures. There is usually a narrow zone of high temperature immediately at the tip
19 of the instruments with a sharp drop in temperature in the deeper tissue further away. In
20 excised specimens cautery changes (darkening and nuclear streaming) are seen within
21 1-2mm from the cauterized surface. In these areas, mesh fibers showed sites where
22 both the outer degraded polypropylene “bark” phase and the inner non-degraded
23 polypropylene phase melted and mixed to form a single homogeneous phase [Figure 5].
24 The phase-mixed regions did not absorb histological dyes, thereby showing that they
25 lack porosity observed in the degraded polypropylene. The fact that the “bark” was
26 melted during excision surgery indicated that the degradation layer was formed in the
27 body before the excision surgery. The finding also revealed that the fiber core and the
28 outer “bark” are composed of materials with similar chemical compositions that are
29 miscible with each other when heated.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Transmission electron microscopy (TEM)** 52

53 We used TEM to study the ultrastructural organisation of the degraded layer in cross
54 sections. The mesh fibers showed an outer “bark” similar to that seen by light
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 microscopy [Figure 6(a)]. There were no fibrillary (collagen, amyloid etc.) or other
4 structures of connective tissue matrix within the “bark”. Material composition of the
5 outer layer and the core showed similar electron density; however, at high magnification
6 the outer “bark” was noticeably more granular, especially towards the surface [Figure
7 6(a), insert]. The “bark” material had a lattice of fine branching cracks (nanocracks).
8
9 This network of nanocracks was sparse closer to the core and expanded towards the
10 surface [Figure 6(b)]. As seen in Figure 6(b) in addition to the nanocracks there were
11 also occasional larger cracks occurring at random. These larger cracks seen by TEM
12 corresponded to the cracks seen by light microscopy either on the surface [Figure 1] or
13 in cross sections [Figure 2].
14
15

16 The “bark” either had a gradual transition into the core [Figure 6(b)] or showed a
17 zone of circumferential fissuring partially separating it from the core [Figure 6(a)]. The
18 mechanisms of “bark” separation from the core and formation of the larger cracks are
19 likely linked since the cracks tended to turn at the interface between the “bark” and the
20 core [Figure 6(b)]. The forces which produced the transverse (radial) cracks also acted
21 as shear forces between the “bark” and the core.
22
23

24 An important finding was the detection of inflammatory cells partially migrated
25 into and trapped within the fissures as shown in Figure 6(c). The shape of widened
26 crevices and the depth of penetration indicated an active *in vivo* cellular migration. This
27 phenomenon was observed at two separate sites.
28
29

30 For better demonstration of the degradation “bark” we used light microscopic and
31 TEM images to generate a 3-dimensional restoration of a mesh fiber [Figure 7].
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Thickness of degradation layer vs. in vivo and in vitro intervals

Out of all the specimens, 23 samples of explanted midurethral slings formed the largest group of meshes from the same manufacturer, of identical mesh type and with reliable records of implantation and excision dates. The range of *in vivo* interval (between implantation to excision) in the group was 18 to 97 months (mean 53). There was a good correlation (Pearson = 0.73) between the thickness of the degradation layer and the duration of *in vivo* exposure indicating that the thickness of degraded material grows while the mesh is in the body [Figure 8(a&b)]. There was a trend for a more rapid initial growth with gradual plateau subsequently.

The “bark” thickness was also analyzed in relation to polypropylene exposure to formalin. Duration of storage of the specimens in formalin ranged from 3 to 32 months (mean 19) for the group. There was no correlation between the thickness of degradation layer and the duration of mesh exposure to formalin (Pearson = -0.06).

Testing of pristine mesh

Samples of three pristine midurethral slings were subjected to formalin fixation followed by tissue processing and H&E staining to reproduce the exposure of explant specimens to the potential factors of postoperative polypropylene degradation *in vitro*. There was no detectable degradation of polypropylene exposed to formalin up to 4 months followed by routine histological processing. This testing showed that exposures to formalin up to 4 months and to the chemical and temperature factors of histological processing do not affect polypropylene to a degree detectable by light microscopy. In comparison, in our pool of mesh explants, 27 specimens had exposure to formalin of

1
2
3 less than one month. The findings were in keeping with wide acceptance of
4
5 polypropylene resistance to formalin for industrial purposes.³³
6
7
8
9

10 **DISCUSSION**
11

12 Previous studies focused on examination of the surface and mechanical properties of
13 explanted fibers and have indicated that polypropylene degrades when exposed to the
14 physiological environment.^{16, 21-29} These conclusions have been questioned recently,^{10,}
15¹¹ while the expanding clinical use and increasing burden of litigation dictated the need
16 to study the mechanisms of complications. Surprisingly, the main source of information,
17 the pathology specimens explanted because of these complications, have not been duly
18 investigated. Using a cross-sectional microscopy approach, we found that the
19 degradation layer is visible in light microscope from a medium magnification power as a
20 rim of stained material around the mesh fibers. In polarized light, the bright curvilinear
21 particles of separated “bark” can be seen from even low magnification. A number of
22 features confirmed that the “bark” is degraded polypropylene [Table 2] and that the
23 degradation occurred *in vivo* [Table 3]. Although the mesh has been in use for several
24 decades, we found no description of these findings in published literature after a search
25 through online and printed sources.
26
27

28 Surface cracking of explanted polypropylene devices has been shown by several
29 reports using scanning electron microscopy.²¹⁻²⁹ In these previous studies, transverse
30 cracks in the direction perpendicular to the axis of the fiber were observed, similar to
31 those observed in the explanted meshes from the present study [Figure 1]. We found
32 that these cracks can also be observed and studied by light microscopy, which allows
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for examination of the surface of the fibers immediately after excision, thereby avoiding
4
5 possible artifacts of drying and chemical treatments.
6
7

8 Previous studies utilizing SEM to characterize surface degradation have been
9
10 challenged on the basis of the cracks being biological in origin.^{11, 34} The advantage of
11
12 cross-sectional analysis by light microscopy and TEM used in the present study is that
13
14 the degraded "bark", the non-degraded polypropylene core, and the surrounding tissue
15
16 can be examined in the same section. A variety of histochemical and
17
18 immunohistochemical stains were utilized to show by light microscopy that the
19
20 interfacial "bark" layer between the polypropylene core and adjacent tissue was
21
22 degraded polypropylene. The "bark" layer was further studied using TEM and the
23
24 examination revealed ultrastructural features of degradation. Thus, our findings support
25
26 the notion that the transverse cracks observed in previous preclinical and clinical
27
28 studies represent surface degradation of polypropylene.
29
30
31

32 We observed degradation in all except two explants, one of which was implanted
33
34 for 3 months and another for 10 months. Thus, the degraded layer does not become
35
36 reliably visible by light microscopy until about a year after implantation. Similarly, a
37
38 previous study has reported that polypropylene pelvic meshes explanted from patients
39
40 less than 3 months after implantation showed no observable evidence of degradation by
41
42 SEM.²⁴ Another study found that unstabilized polypropylene sutures implanted
43
44 subcutaneously in guinea pigs became chemically induced, which initiates the
45
46 degradation process after 108 days.¹⁶ For light microscopy, an additional lag time of
47
48 several months is required for the degraded layer to become detectable in cross-
49
50 sections and this needs to be considered in future studies.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Several studies indicated that polypropylene degradation is likely mediated by the
4 foreign body reaction, which is ongoing until the device is removed.³⁵ Our observations
5 of adherent macrophages on the polypropylene surface are consistent with the previous
6 studies reporting chronic inflammation in explanted polypropylene mesh several years
7 after implantation.^{23, 24, 27, 36} We observed strong staining for oxidative enzyme
8 myeloperoxidase produced by the macrophages in the tissue surrounding the mesh
9 fibers. This indicated that, the surface of the polypropylene was exposed to reactive
10 oxygen species (ROS) while oxidation of polypropylene as a result of the foreign body
11 reaction has been suggested as the mechanism of degradation by earlier reports.^{24-27, 29,}
12
13

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 For many polymers, the rate of oxidation is controlled by the rate of diffusion of
47 molecular oxygen into the polymer.³⁷⁻³⁹ We have proposed a mechanism of
48 polypropylene oxidation under simulated in vivo conditions in which oxidation is initiated
49 by ROS attack on the tertiary hydrogen on the polypropylene surface followed by
50 diffusion of molecular oxygen into the polymer (Talley et al. submitted). In the present
51 study, using a subset of 23 mid-urethral slings from the same manufacturer, we showed
52 that the thickness of the "bark" layer increased with time, in a manner consistent with a
53 reaction-diffusion mechanism.³⁷

46 Clinical significance of polypropylene degradation

47
48 It is important to know the effect of degradation of an implanted material on the
49 body and on the long-term performance of the device. When physical and chemical
50 characteristics of a material undergo changes in the body its applications should include
51 planning for safe and complete removal with minimal tissue damage. This exit-strategy
52
53
54
55
56

1
2
3 is especially important in younger patients, proximity to organs and large vessels, and
4
5 anatomical sites which are difficult to reach.
6
7

8 The clinical descriptions provided with the specimens indicated that in many
9
10 cases mesh-related complications develop several years after mesh implantation. The
11
12 exact mechanisms of these late complications are yet to be understood, however
13
14 factors accumulating over time need to be considered as primary contributors. As we
15
16 showed, the degraded layer becomes thicker over time while its cracking indicated
17
18 brittleness and loss of flexibility. Although the degraded layer is thin in relation to the
19
20 fiber diameter, its circumferential distribution provides the highest mechanical effect on
21
22 the mesh fibers. Degradation related stiffening of the mesh is expected to increase over
23
24 time.
25
26

27 Another clinically important aspect of degradation is the potential for bacterial
28
29 colonization of the fissures within the degraded material. It is known that irregularities of
30
31 polymer surface promote bacterial adherence.^{40,41}
32
33

34 A described effect of degradation and wear of medical devices is the release of
35
36 material particles. The debris from prosthetic joints is well known to cause tissue
37
38 necrosis, inflammation and fibrosis around the joints.⁴²⁻⁴⁴ For polypropylene meshes, we
39
40 observed occasional particles of degraded polypropylene in the surrounding tissue and
41
42 macrophages. The load of these visible particles was limited; however we could not test
43
44 for the presence of smaller particles, not detectable by light microscope, and chemical
45
46 products of degradation. Outside the body, thermal degradation of polypropylene
47
48 produces an array of organic molecules such as acids, ketones, ethers, aldehydes,
49
50 alcohols and smaller hydrocarbons.⁴⁵ The conditions of thermal degradation of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 polypropylene do not match those of degradation in the body; however the results can
4
5 be used to estimate the range of chemicals that can be potentially produced in the
6
7 tissue. Additionally, if additives are used to stabilize the polymer or improve its other
8
9 characteristics, they can also leach into the tissue. Recently, additives leaching from
10
11 polypropylene labware were shown to affect cultured cells *in vitro*.⁴⁶ A systemic effect
12
13 on humans was detected when intravenous injections of saline from prefilled and stored
14
15 polypropylene syringes were found to alter smell and taste in pediatric patients.⁴⁷
16
17 Locally, the molecules released from polypropylene mesh may play role in direct and
18
19 inflammation-mediated tissue damage with subsequent repair. It has been shown
20
21 recently that the scar around mesh fibers undergoes a continuous remodelling.⁴⁸
22
23

24
25 A potential adverse effect of implantable devices is oncogenesis. Oncogenic
26
27 mechanisms may be related to chemical composition of the device or other factors of
28
29 device-body interactions. A complicating aspect of studying mutagens is the length of
30
31 the latency period. For example, radiation induced sarcomas have a median latency
32
33 period of 10 years with a range 2-50 years.⁴⁹
34
35

36
37 Because of different developmental pathways, the potential tumorigenic effects
38
39 need to be analyzed separately for mesenchymal neoplasms, lymphomas, and
40
41 carcinomas (epithelial tumors). A number of mesenchymal neoplasms have been
42
43 reported in association with breast and joint prostheses with the latency period of up to
44
45 33 (mean 11) years.^{50,51} In relation to polypropylene mesh, one case of myofibroblastic
46
47 tumor has been reported recently.⁵²
48
49

50
51 With regards to lymphoid cells, specific lymphomas associated with breast
52
53 implants have been categorized as an entity since primary breast lymphomas are
54
55
56

1
2
3 extremely rare without implants.^{53, 54} The neoplasms develop in association with either
4 saline or silicone filled implants and the exact source of carcinogenicity is not known
5 presently. It may be related to a higher turnover of inflammatory cells surrounding the
6 implants. Median latency period was reported 9 years (range 1-32).⁵⁴ There have been
7 no reports of a lymphoma at a site of polypropylene mesh implantation.
8
9

10
11 Few carcinomas have been reported in association with implantable devices.
12
13 This risk appears to be related to chronic irritation and inflammation as it is known that
14 the long-standing non-healing wounds are a risk factor for squamous cell carcinoma.
15
16 Individual cases of squamous cell carcinomas have been reported developing in the
17 chronic wounds of exposed hernia mesh.⁵⁵ There appears to be no specific risk for
18 squamous or other type of carcinoma without mesh exposure through the skin.
19
20

21
22 Based on the analysis of published literature and considering the long term
23 clinical use of polypropylene mesh, the oncogenic risks, if present, are very low.
24
25 However, continuous introduction of new designs and possible changes of the sources
26 of the raw material pose a potential problem with respect to the variation of chemical
27 composition and new effects on the body.
28
29

30 31 32 33 34 CONCLUSIONS 35 36 37 38 39

40
41
42
43
44
45 The expanded use of polypropylene mesh in clinical practice and the subsequent
46 increase in the number and nature of complications necessitate the study of the
47 mechanisms of those complications. Explants from patients are the primary source of
48 information regarding these mechanisms; however the material has been largely
49 underutilized. We have shown that a focused examination of explanted specimens can
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reveal features which have been overlooked for decades. Specifically, polypropylene
4 degradation can be detected by readily available conventional light microscopy. A
5 number of features indicated that polypropylene degrades while in the body. Both
6 physical and chemical aspects of polypropylene degradation need to be studied more
7 extensively for their roles in the development of these complications. The described
8 methods of light microscopy can also be used to study degradation of other materials.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

Authors provided expert opinions for medico-legal cases on matters related to polypropylene mesh.

1
2
3 **References**
4

5

- 6 Usher FC, Cogan JE, Lowry TI. A new technique for the repair of inguinal and
7 incisional hernias. *Arch Surg* 1960;81:847.
- 8 Klinge U, Klosterhalfen B, Birkenhauer V, Junge K, Conze J, Schumpelick V.
9 Impact of polymer pore size on the interface scar formation in a rat model. *J
10 Surg Res* 2002;103:208-14.
- 11 Sanders DL, Kingsnorth AN. Prosthetic mesh materials used in hernia surgery.
12 *Expert Rev Med Devices* 2012;9:159-79.
- 13 Bontje HF, van de Pol G, van der Zaag-Loonen HJ, Spaans WA. Follow-up of
14 mesh complications using the IUGA/ICS category-time-site coding classification.
15 *Int Urogynecol J* 2014;25:817-22.
- 16 Bontinck J, Kyle-Leinhase I, Pletinckx P, Vergucht V, Beckers R, Muysoms F, et
17 al. Single centre observational study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the
18 Proceed™ Ventral Patch to repair small ventral hernias. *Hernia* 2014;18:671-80
- 19 Albino FP, Patel KM, Nahabedian MY, Sosin M, Attinger CE, Bhanot P. Does
20 mesh location matter in abdominal wall reconstruction? A systematic review of
21 the literature and a summary of recommendations, *Plast Reconstr Surg*
22 2013;132:1295-304.
- 23 7 Ellington DR, Richter HE. Indications, contraindications, and complications of
24 mesh in surgical treatment of pelvic organ prolapse. *Clin Obstet Gynecol*
25 2013;56:276-88.
- 26 8 Van Geelen JM, Dwyer PL. Where to for pelvic organ prolapse treatment after
27 the FDA pronouncements? A systematic review of the recent literature. *Int
28 Urogynecol J* 2013;24:707-18.
- 29 9 Maher C, Feiner B, Baessler K, Schmid C. Surgical management of pelvic organ
30 prolapse in women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;4:CD004014.
- 31 10 Sternschuss G, Ostergaard D, Patel H. Post-Implantation Alterations of
32 Polypropylene in the Human. *J Urol* 2012;188:27-32.
- 33 11 Keys T, Aboushwareb T, Badlani G. Re: post-implantation alterations of
34 polypropylene in the human. *J Urol* 2013;189:1996-2000.
- 35 12 Rosa DS, Angelini JMG, Agnelli JAM, Mei LHI. The use of optical microscopy to
36 follow the degradation of isotactic polypropylene (iPP) subjected to natural and
37 accelerated aging. *Polymer Testing* 2005;24:1022-26.
- 38 13 Schmidt H, Witkowska B, Kamińska I, Twarowska-Schmidt K, Wierus K,
39 Puchowicz D. Comparison of the Rates of Polypropylene Fibre Degradation
40 Caused by Artificial Light and Sunlight. *FIBRES & TEXTILES in Eastern Europe*
41 2011;4:53-58.
- 42 14 Blais P, Carlsson DJ, Clark FRS, Sturgeon PZ, Wiles DM. The Photo-Oxidation
43 of Polypropylene Monofilaments: Part II: Physical Changes and Microstructure.
44 *Textile Research Journal* 1976;46:641-64.
- 45 15 Longo C, Savaris M, Zeni M, Brandalise RN, Grisa AMC. Degradation study of
46 polypropylene (PP) and bioriented polypropylene (BOPP) in the environment.
47 *Materials Research* 2011;14:442-448.

1
2
3 16. Liebert TC, Chartoff RP, Cosgrove SL, McCuskey RS. Subcutaneous implants of
4 polypropylene filaments. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research, Part A*
5 1976;10: 939–951.
6
7 17. Bertin D, Leblanc M, Marque S, Siri D. Polypropylene degradation: Theoretical
8 and experimental investigations. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*
9 2010;95:782–791.
10
11 18. Ali SAM, Doherty P J, Williams DF. The Mechanisms of Oxidative Degradation of
12 Biomedical Polymers by Free Radicals. *J Appl Poly Sci* 1994;51:1389-1398.
13
14 19. King, R. N., & Lyman, D. J. Polymers in contact with the body. *Environmental*
15 *health perspectives*. 1975;11:71-74.
16
17 20. Williams DF. Review: biodegradation of surgical polymers. *J Mater Sci*
18 1982;17:1233.
19
20 21. Jongebloed WL, Worst JF. Degradation of polypropylene in the human eye: a
21 SEM-study. *Advances In Ophthalmology* 1986;64:143-152.
22
23 22. Costello CR, Bachman SL, Grant SA, Cleveland DS, Loy TS. Characterization of
24 heavyweight and lightweight polypropylene prosthetic mesh explants from a
25 single patient. *Surg Innov* 2007;14:168-176.
26
27 23. Costello CR, Bachman S, Ramshaw BJ, Grant SA. Materials characterization of
28 explanted polypropylene hernia meshes. *Journal of Biomedical Materials*
29 *Research Part B: Applied Biomaterials* 2007;838:44-49.
30
31 24. Clave A, Yahi H, Hammou J, Montanari S, Gounon P, Clave H. Polypropylene as
32 a reinforcement in pelvic surgery is not inert comparative analysis of 100
33 explants. *Int Urogynecol J* 2010;21:261-70.
34
35 25. Cozad M, Grant D, Bachman SL, Grant DN, Ramshaw BJ, Grant SA. Materials
36 characterization of explanted polypropylene, polyethylene terephthalate and
37 expanded polytetrafluoroethylene composites: Spectral and thermal analysis. *J*
38 *Biomed Mater Res* 2010;94B:455-462.
39
40 26. Ostergard D. Degradation, infection and heat effects on polypropylene mesh for
41 pelvic implantation: what was known and when it was known. *Int Urogynecol J*
42 2011;22:771-774.
43
44 27. Wood AJ, Cozad MJ, Grant DA, Ostliek AM, Bachman SL, Grant SA. Materials
45 characterization and histological analysis of explanted polypropylene, PTFE, and
46 PET hernia meshes from an individual patient. *J Mater Sci Mater Med*
47 2013;24:1113-22.
48
49 28. Coda A, Bendavid R, Botto-Micca F, Bossotti M, Bona A. Structural alterations of
50 prosthetic meshes in humans. *Hernia* 2003;7:29-34.
51
52 29. C Mary, Y Marois, M W. King, G Laroche, Y Douville, L Martin, R Guidoin,
53 Comparison of the In Vivo Behaviour of Polyvinylidene Fluoride and
54 Polypropylene Sutures Used in Vascular Surgery, *ASA/O Journal*, 1998;44:199-
55 206
56
57 30. Bancroft J, Gamble M. Theory and Practice of Histological Techniques. Churchill
58 Livingston 2002; fifth edition.
59
60 31. Carson F, Hladik C. Histotechnology: A Self-instructional Text. ASCP Press
2009; third edition.

1
2
3 32. Stewart MJ. On the use of polarized light in the detection and investigation of
4 suture materials embedded in the tissues. *The British Medical Journal*
5 1920;May:663-5.
6 33. [http://www.hmcpolymers.com/uploads/files/resources/hmc-pp-chemical-](http://www.hmcpolymers.com/uploads/files/resources/hmc-pp-chemical-resistance.PDF)
7 [resistance.PDF](http://www.hmcpolymers.com/uploads/files/resources/hmc-pp-chemical-resistance.PDF)
8 a. <http://www.gilsoneng.com/reference/ChemRes.pdf>
9 b. https://plasticpipe.org/pdf/tr-19_thermoplastic_pipe_for_transport_of_chemical.pdf
10 c. <http://www.quickcutgasket.com/pdf/Chemical-Resistance-Chart.pdf>
11 d. http://www.reln.com.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/PP_Chemical_Resistance.pdf
12
13 34. de Tayrac R, Letouzey V. Basic science and clinical aspects of mesh infection in
14 pelvic floor reconstructive surgery. *Int Urogynecol J* 2011;22:775-80.
15 35. Anderson JM, Rodriguez A, Chang DT. Foreign body reaction to biomaterials.
16 *Semin Immunol.* 2008;20:86-100.
17 36. Huber A, McCabe GP, Boruch AV, Medberry C, Honerlaw M, Badylak SF.
18 Polypropylene-containing synthetic mesh devices in soft tissue repair: a meta-
19 analysis. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater.* 2012;100:145-54.
20 37. Schubert MA, Wiggins MJ, Anderson JM, Hiltner A. The effect of strain state on
21 the biostability of a poly(etherurethane urea) elastomer. *J Biomed Mater Res.*
22 1997;35:319-28.
23 38. A. Popov, N. Rapoport, and G. Zaikov, *Oxidation of Stressed Polymers*, Gordon
24 and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1991.
25 39. A. V. Cunliffe, A. Davis. Photo-oxidation of thick polymer samples—part II: The
26 influence of oxygen diffusion on the natural and artificial weathering of
27 polyolefins. *Polymer Deg Stabil* 1982;4:17-37.
28 40. An YH, Friedman RJ. Concise review of mechanisms of bacterial adhesion to
29 biomaterial surfaces. *J Biomed Mater Res.* 1998;43:338-48
30 41. Katsikogianni M1, Missirlis YF. Concise review of mechanisms of bacterial
31 adhesion to biomaterials and of techniques used in estimating bacteria-material
32 interactions. *Eur Cell Mater* 2004;7:37-57.
33 42. Gallo J, Goodman SB, Konttinen YT, Wimmer MA, Holinka M. Osteolysis around
34 total knee arthroplasty: a review of pathogenetic mechanisms. *Acta Biomater*
35 2013;9:8046-58.
36 43. Del Bravo V, Graci C, Spinelli MS, Muratori F, Maccauro G. Histological and
37 ultrastructural reaction to different materials for orthopaedic application. *Int J*
38 *Immunopathol Pharmacol* 2011;24(1 Suppl 2):91-4.
39 44. Revell PA. The combined role of wear particles, macrophages and lymphocytes
40 in the loosening of total joint prostheses. *J R Soc Interface* 2008;5:1263-78.
41 45. Frostling H, Hoff A, Jacobsson S, Pfaffli P, Vainiotalo S, Zitting A. Analytical,
42 occupational and toxicologic aspects of the degradation products of
43 polypropylene plastics. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 1984;10:163-169.
44 46. Lee TW, Tumanov S, Villas-Bôas SG, Montgomery JM, Birch NP. Chemicals
45 eluting from disposable plastic syringes and syringe filters alter neurite growth,
46 axogenesis and the microtubule cytoskeleton in cultured hippocampal neurons. *J*
47 *Neurochem* 2014;Dec 18[Epub ahead of print].
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 47. Mancini D, Vaillancourt R, Pouliot A, Lin A, Sharp D. Taste and Odour
4 Disturbances in Pediatric Patients Undergoing IV Flush with Normal Saline
5 Administered by Prefilled or Freshly Prepared Syringes: Randomized Single-
6 Blind Study. *Can J Hosp Pharm* 2014;67:353-7.
7
8 48. Junge K, Rosch R, Bialasinski L, Klinge U, Klosterhalfen B, Schumpelick V.
9 Persistent extracellular matrix remodelling at the interface to polymers used for
10 hernia repair. *Eur Surg Res* 2003;35:497-504.
11
12 49. Patel SR. Radiation-induced sarcoma. *Curr Treat Options Oncol* 2000;1:258-61.
13
14 50. Balzer BL, Weiss SW. Do biomaterials cause implant-associated mesenchymal
15 tumors of the breast? Analysis of 8 new cases and review of the literature. *Hum
Pathol* 2009;40:1564-70.
16
17 51. Keel SB, Jaffe KA, Petur Nielsen G, Rosenberg AE. Orthopaedic implant-related
18 sarcoma: a study of twelve cases. *Mod Pathol* 2001;14:969-77.
19
20 52. Kwon SY, Latchamsetty KC, Benson J, Carreno M. Inflammatory myofibroblastic
21 tumor of the urinary tract following a TVT. *Journal of Pelvic Medicine and Surgery*
22 2012;18:249-51.
23
24 53. Taylor CR, Siddiqi IN, Brody GS. Anaplastic large cell lymphoma occurring in
25 association with breast implants: review of pathologic and immunohistochemical
26 features in 103 cases. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol* 2013;21:13-20.
27
28 54. Thompson PA, Prince HM. Breast implant-associated anaplastic large cell
29 lymphoma: a systematic review of the literature and mini-meta analysis. *Curr
Hematol Malig Rep* 2013;8:196-210.
30
31 55. Birolini C, Minossi JG, Lima CF, Utiyama EM, Rasslan S. Mesh cancer: long-
32 term mesh infection leading to squamous-cell carcinoma of the abdominal wall.
Hernia 2014;18:897-901.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **TABLE I. Sample and patient data**
5

6	7	8	Patient age	Mesh in vivo	Symptoms , %		
9	10	11	Years, median (range)	Months, median (range)	Pain, dyspareunia	Erosion	Urinary symptoms
TRANSVAGINAL							
13	Slings, n						
14	AMS *Sparc/Monarc	21					
15	BSC** Obtryx/Adv.	16					
16	Ethicon TVT/TVT-O	28	69				
17	Bard Align	4					
18							
19	Pelvic organ prolapse, n						
20	AMS Apogee/Perig.	16		52 (25-71)	48 (10-108)	57	38
21	BSC Pinnacle/Uphold	8					33
22	Ethicon Prolift	4	42				
23	Bard Avaulta	9					
24	Undetermined	5					
25							
26	HERNIA						
27	Inguinal, n						
28	Ethicon Prolene	3					
29	Bard Marlex	5	37				
30	Undetermined	29		47 (24-82)	36 (3-169)	48	52
31							
32	Ventral, n						
33	Undetermined		16				

40
41 *American Medical Systems
42
43 **Boston Scientific
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2

3 **TABLE 2. Features confirming polypropylene degradation**

4

5 **Evidence that the outer “bark” is degraded polypropylene**

6

7 Surface cracking observed in fresh specimen immediately after excision

8 Birefringence of the “bark” is the same as of the fiber core

9 Sites of gradual transition between the core and the “bark”

10 Retention of blue dye granules (introduced during manufacturing) in the “bark”

11 Sharp demarcation between body proteins and the “bark”

12 Ability of the “bark” material to meld with non-degraded core at high temperatures

13 No detectable levels of calcium salts as commonly seen in brittle biological materials

14 Increasing degree of porosity/degradation towards the surface

15 No elements of tissue matrix in the “bark” by TEM

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **TABLE 3. Features confirming that degradation occurs *in vivo***

26

27

28 **Evidence that polypropylene degradation occurs *in vivo***

29

30 No detectable degradation of pristine meshes after exposure to formalin and tissue processing

31 Surface cracking observed in fresh specimen immediately after excision

32 Gradual increase in “bark” thickness during the years in the body

33 No correlation between the “bark” thickness and duration of storage in formalin

34 Entrapment of inflammatory cells and tissue matrix in the “bark” fissures

35 Melting of the “bark” by surgical cautery (presence before excision surgery)




FIGURE 1. Surface of the mesh fibers immediately after explantation from the body, transvaginal sling explanted due to pain 9 years after implantation, light microscope, 20x objective with image crop. Mesh fibers at the specimen edges had no covering tissue and could be examined as they were in the body, avoiding possible artifacts of tissue removal, drying or contact with formalin. Both blue (a) and clear (b) fibers showed surface cracking.




FIGURE 2. Histological sections, H&E stain, 100x objective with oil immersion. The same cross section of a clear mesh fiber in regular (a) and polarized (b) light. The fiber has a layer of staining degraded polypropylene at the surface (between arrowheads). This layer has refractile properties of polypropylene in polarized light (b). In some areas the non-degraded core of the fibers detaches during histological processing while segments of the degraded layer stay attached to the tissue. Separated degradation layer in regular (c) and polarized (d) light. At sites like this, intensity of light passing through the degraded layer cannot be attributed to light scatter from the core. Note that tissue components including collagen have a much weaker birefringence than polypropylene (b and d).




FIGURE 3. Degradation “bark” of the blue fibers manufactured with inclusion of blue dye granules, H&E stain, 100x objective with oil immersion: (a) and (b) non-degraded core (left half of the images) and the degraded layer (between arrowheads). Note that the blue granules are retained in the layer of degraded polypropylene. Within the degraded “bark”, the granules degrade and loose color toward the surface. In (c) and (d) the non-degraded core detached from the slides similarly to Figure 2(c and d). At these sites, presence of the granules in the separated “bark” cannot be attributed to an overlap with the core.




FIGURE 4. Additional stains, all images taken with 100x oil immersion objective and cropped to a different magnification, polypropylene degradation layer is pointed between arrowheads: (a) Von Kossa stain is negative for calcium in the brittle "bark" (would stain calcium black), (b) trichrome stain shows that the deeper parts of the "bark" have smaller staining porosity (red) than those close to the surface (green) which correlates with TEM findings [Figure 6(b)], (c) immunohistochemical stain for immunoglobulin G (IgG, stained brown). IgG is present in almost all human tissues and fluids. It is deposited on the surface of degraded polypropylene but is not mixed within it. (d) Immunostain for the oxidizing enzyme of inflammatory cells myeloperoxidase (stains brown).




FIGURE 5. Melting of both non-degraded and degraded polypropylene caused by the surgical cautery, H&E, 100x oil immersion: (a) and (b) the same site of fiber melting in regular and polarized light, (c) and (d) another site showing melding point. While molten the non-degraded core and the degradation "bark" formed a common pool of material.




FIGURE 6. Transmission electron microscopy. (a) Low power magnification of a cross-sectioned mesh fiber shows the degradation layer similarly to light microscopy, the insert shows an image composed of three high power fields to reconstruct the transition between the non-degraded core and the degradation "bark". Note the fine nanocracks/nanopores in the degraded material. (b) Outer part of the fiber with gradual transition between the non-degraded core and the degraded polypropylene at the surface. The lattice of nanocracks expands towards the surface (left to right). There are also two larger cracks which start perpendicular to the surface but then turn at the

1
2
3 interface between the core and the degraded layer. (c) A part of inflammatory cell
4 (labeled C in insert) is trapped in a fissure within the degraded polypropylene (PP).
5 Higher magnification (insert) shows cellular membrane at the cell-polypropylene
6 interface (left wall of the fissure) and cellular organelles in the cell (chains of rounded
7 structures, likely ribosomes).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review




FIGURE 7. A 3-dimensional restoration of a cross sectioned mesh fiber.




FIGURE 8. Duration of *in vivo* exposure vs. thickness of degraded layer in a group of explants of the same manufacturer and the same mesh design. (a) Thickness of the degradation “bark” increased over the years *in vivo* (Pearson correlation = 0.73). Note the trend of plateauing after 5-6 years. There was no correlation of the thickness with the duration of specimen storage in formalin (not shown, Pearson = -0.06). (b) Comparison of the “bark” in meshes explanted after 12 and 72 months in the body, H&E, 100x objective with oil immersion, images cropped to the same magnification factor.





FIGURE 1. Surface of the mesh fibers immediately after explantation from the body, transvaginal sling explanted due to pain 9 years after implantation, light microscope, 20x objective with image crop. Mesh fibers at the specimen edges had no covering tissue and could be examined as they were in the body, avoiding possible artifacts of tissue removal, drying or contact with formalin. Both blue (a) and clear (b) fibers showed surface cracking.

77x40mm (600 x 600 DPI)



40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 2. Histological sections, H&E stain, 100x objective with oil immersion. The same cross section of a clear mesh fiber in regular (a) and polarized (b) light. The fiber has a layer of staining degraded polypropylene at the surface (between arrowheads). This layer has refractile properties of polypropylene in polarized light (b). In some areas the non-degraded core of the fibers detaches during histological processing while segments of the degraded layer stay attached to the tissue. Separated degradation layer in regular (c) and polarized (d) light. At sites like this, intensity of light passing through the degraded layer cannot be attributed to light scatter from the core. Note that tissue components including collagen have a much weaker birefringence than polypropylene (b and d).
149x149mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIGURE 3. Degradation "bark" of the blue fibers manufactured with inclusion of blue dye granules, H&E stain, 100x objective with oil immersion: (a) and (b) non-degraded core (left half of the images) and the degraded layer (between arrowheads). Note that the blue granules are retained in the layer of degraded polypropylene. Within the degraded "bark", the granules degrade and loose color toward the surface. In (c) and (d) the non-degraded core detached from the slides similarly to Figure 2(c and d). At these sites, presence of the granules in the separated "bark" cannot be attributed to an overlap with the core.

69x31mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIGURE 4. Additional stains, all images taken with 100x oil immersion objective and cropped to a different magnification, polypropylene degradation layer is pointed between arrowheads: (a) Von Kossa stain is negative for calcium in the brittle "bark" (would stain calcium black), (b) trichrome stain shows that the deeper parts of the "bark" have smaller staining porosity (red) than those close to the surface (green) which correlates with TEM findings [Figure 6(b)], (c) immunohistochemical stain for immunoglobulin G (IgG, stained brown). IgG is present in almost all human tissues and fluids. It is deposited on the surface of degraded polypropylene but is not mixed within it. (d) Immunostain for the oxidizing enzyme of inflammatory cells myeloperoxidase (stains brown).

74x36mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIGURE 5. Melting of both non-degraded and degraded polypropylene caused by the surgical cautery, H&E, 100x oil immersion: (a) and (b) the same site of fiber melting in regular and polarized light, (c) and (d) another site showing melding point. While molten the non-degraded core and the degradation "bark" formed a common pool of material.
159x169mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIGURE 6. Transmission electron microscopy. (a) Low power magnification of a cross-sectioned mesh fiber shows the degradation layer similarly to light microscopy, the insert shows an image composed of three high power fields to reconstruct the transition between the non-degraded core and the degradation "bark". Note the fine nanocracks/nanopores in the degraded material. (b) Outer part of the fiber with gradual transition between the non-degraded core and the degraded polypropylene at the surface. The lattice of nanocracks expands towards the surface (left to right). There are also two larger cracks which start perpendicular to the surface but then turn at the interface between the core and the degraded layer. (c) A part of inflammatory cell (labeled C in insert) is trapped in a fissure within the degraded polypropylene (PP). Higher magnification (insert) shows cellular membrane at the cell-polypropylene interface (left wall of the fissure) and cellular organelles in the cell (chains of rounded structures, likely ribosomes).

179x215mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIGURE 7. A 3-dimensional restoration of a cross sectioned mesh fiber.
114x88mm (600 x 600 DPI)




FIGURE 8. Duration of in vivo exposure vs. thickness of degraded layer in a group of explants of the same manufacturer and the same mesh design. (a) Thickness of the degradation "bark" increased over the years in vivo (Pearson correlation = 0.73). Note the trend of plateauing after 5-6 years. There was no correlation of the thickness with the duration of specimen storage in formalin (not shown, Pearson = -0.06). (b) Comparison of the "bark" in meshes explanted after 12 and 72 months in the body, H&E, 100x objective with oil immersion, images cropped to the same magnification factor.

166x185mm (600 x 600 DPI)